



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,760	08/17/2001	Axel Brenner	MO-6535/LEA 33.042	5279

157 7590 03/03/2003

BAYER POLYMERS LLC  
100 BAYER ROAD  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15205

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SZEKELY, PETER A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1714

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2003

S

Please find below, and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/913,760	BRENNER ET AL
	Examiner Peter Szekely	Art Unit 1714
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
<b>Period for Reply</b>		
<b>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> <li>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>		
<b>Status</b>		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 August 2001</u> .		
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.                    2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>		
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-10, 12 and 14-27</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.		
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-10, 12 and 14-27</u> is/are rejected.		
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.		
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
<b>Application Papers</b>		
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.		
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120</b>		
13) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of:		
1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.		
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).		
a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.		
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
<b>Attachment(s)</b>		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.		
4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.		

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 2 contains improper Markush language. The other rejected claims do not make it clear that the oxide does not have to be an alkaline earth metal oxide. The format of claim 14 is advised.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-10, 12 and 14-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Krishnan et al. 4,650,823, Takahashi et al. 4,713,408, Umeda et al. 5,449,710 or Ishii et al. 6,369,141, in view of Mark 3,919,167, Mark et al. 3,933,734, Torimae et al. 5,849,001 or Nagashima et al. 5,910,560.
6. Since a certified English translation of the priority document is not in the file, the effective filing date of the instant application is 8/17/01. Krishnan et al. disclose

polycarbonate, black or red iron oxide and PTFE in the Abstract, sulfonic acid salts and sulfonates in column 5, line 45 and particle size of the iron oxide in column 4, lines 58-62. The two Mark patents teach the sulfonic acid salts and sulfonates used by Krishnan et al. in Table I and the claims. Takahashi et al. teach polybutylene terephthalate in the Abstract, salts of sulfonic acid in the Tables and claim 5 and silica (silicon dioxide) having a particle size of 10-300 millimicron (nanometer) in column 3, lines 13-19. Umeda et al. recite polycarbonate, salts of perfluoroalkanesulfonic acid and inorganic filler in the Abstract and CR-60 titanium oxide in column 12, lines 45-46. Torimae et al., in column 13, lines 32-35, and Nagashima et al. in column 10, lines 35-36, report that the average particle diameter of said CR-60 is 200 nm. Ishii et al. reveal polycarbonate, PTFE and sulfonic acid metal salt in the Abstract and titanium oxide having a diameter between 100 and 400 nanometers in column 10, lines 36-45. Applicants' claims are not novel. In the alternative, the two Marks patents, Torimae et al. and Nagashima et al. supply the information to prove that Krishnan et al. and Umeda et al. disclose all the ingredients claimed by applicants, making the selection of these ingredients obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is 703-308-2460. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 703-306-2777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Art Unit: 1714

872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final  
communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or  
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-  
0661.



Peter Szekely  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1714

P.S.  
February 23, 2003